



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

litigation, the companies attempting to evade the plain provision of the law by devious methods well known to such corporations. The amount received from this source in 1895 was \$92,339.20. None of the companies chartered under the general law since 1874 are required to pay this tax, although under the constitution the city has full power to exact such terms as it chooses. As a matter of fact several companies whose charters require them to pay a tax on dividends, are evading the law wholly or in part.

(3) The third source of revenue is a car tax of \$50 per car, from which the city received in 1896, \$97,550. Dr. Speirs justly condemns this form of taxation, as it offers a direct inducement to the companies to furnish inadequate car accommodation, nor is the tax so easy of collection as he seems to think. The total annual return received by the city is placed at \$639,000. It appears from this that Philadelphia is receiving a larger return for the franchise privileges granted than many other large American cities. Unfortunately, however, under the pernicious system of granting perpetual franchises, the city has placed itself beyond the possibility of exacting a return at all approximating the amount it could equitably demand, while many other cities by granting franchises for a limited period will be able later to secure much more favorable terms. Dr. Speirs does not specifically discuss the question of the most desirable form of return for franchise privileges, whether by sale of franchise, by taxation, or by better service, and lower fares. Nor does he discuss the theoretical questions of public ownership, or public control. But the book is bristling with facts bearing upon these questions, and is indispensable to the municipal reformer, studying street railway problems.

It is to be regretted that fuller information could not be given in regard to the financial aspects of the question. But every investigator knows that the methods of accounting and making reports followed by the street railway companies are better adapted to conceal, than to impart information.

ALBERT A. BIRD.

Otto, N. Y.

Southern Statesmen of the Old Régime. By WILLIAM P. TRENT. Pp. xv, 293. Price, \$2.00. New York: T. Y. Crowell & Co., 1896.

In his life of Simms, Professor Trent showed such a sympathetic insight into the political life of the South in *ante bellum* days, that we look to his pen for valuable contributions to this side of American history. The volume under review justifies this expectation. Professor Trent has a rare breadth of view and felicity of literary

style. He makes his characters live before us. They are not mere abstractions or catalogues of attributes, but flesh and blood men of like passions with ourselves. They did not act from different motives than those which actuate us to-day. Trent calls this fact to our minds, from time to time, by such remarks as the following: "But impartiality was never Davis' forte, and where slavery was concerned, he was always preternaturally squint-eyed. . . . Yet I venture to assert that ninety-nine out of a hundred are going, in this presidential year, to be guilty of partisanship just as indiscriminating as Davis', only perhaps less dangerous in its consequences."

The book was originally a series of lectures and bears evident marks of its origin. As his typical Southern statesmen, he chooses Washington, Jefferson, Randolph of Roanoke, Calhoun, Stephens, Toombs, and Jefferson Davis. One naturally asks, why has there been an omission of Marshall, Madison, Monroe, Crawford, Clay, and others; but Professor Trent has anticipated the query and, in his introduction, gives the grounds for his selection. He tells us that: "My opinions are the results of my own studies based chiefly upon Southern materials," and these opinions have a frankness and, often, an originality, which are delightful.

We have too few Southern historians. Here is one, "who cannot recollect ever seeing a slave and who has never believed in the doctrine of states rights *per se*." These are truly the marks of one belonging to a new generation and it is most encouraging to find that a Southerner does not hesitate to admit that the South's position on slavery and disunion was morally and radically wrong. With equal firmness, Professor Trent insists on the honesty of the South. Even Jefferson Davis, whom the North has so hated, may not be considered dishonest, though he was fanatical. The lecture on Calhoun is the most satisfactory chapter in the book. Trent sums up the whole question which presented itself to the men of Calhoun's day in one pregnant sentence: "There was no question as to the legal fact that slavery was acknowledged by the constitution, there should have been no question as to the moral fact that slavery was not acknowledged as legitimate by the conscience of the recently awakened world."

The following sentences are also admirable in their clear apprehension of the position of the two sides to the great controversy: "But the North, recognizing the constitutional obligation to protect slavery, was conscious also of the moral obligation to suppress it, and halting between opinions, proclaimed the doctrine of a 'higher law.' The Southerner was in no such dilemma; he knew that slavery was legal, he could not see that it was immoral; hence he

became righteously indignant at what he was bound to regard as Northern aggression and infractions of the constitution."

The description of the position of the planter class is well done and shows a sympathetic appreciation of their view of political questions. We have left ourselves little space to speak of the first three lectures. That on Washington is extremely eulogistic, that on Jefferson discriminating, that on Randolph most entertaining. Trent's choice of epithets for his protagonists is most happy. So are his comparisons of Washington in politics to Sophocles in literature and of Jefferson to Shelley. Sometimes, however, he makes comparisons which are rather fantastic than just, as when he speaks of Randolph as a compound of Ithuriel and Caliban. Indeed, an excessive desire to be vivid and striking seems the chief defect in the style of the lectures. Impartiality seems characteristic of Trent's view of every man but Alexander Hamilton. For some reason, he is unjust to him. The following sentence is so malignant and untrue as to be ridiculous: "He was selfish and cold, even when the man who had made him what he was lay dead at Mt. Vernon." Even Jefferson knew the chief author of the *Federalist* too well to speak of him in his bitterest moods, as "made" by Washington. The portraits of the men, who are the subjects of the lectures, add much to the value and attractiveness of the book.

The only serious misprint I have found is that John Taylor of Caroline County, Virginia, is always referred to as John Taylor of Carolina. Did the proof-reader refer to Johnson's "Cyclopædia," which, singularly, seems to have omitted the former man?

BERNARD C. STEINER.

Johns Hopkins University.

An Examination of the Nature of the State. A Study in Political Philosophy. By WESTEL WOODBURY WILLOUGHBY, Ph. D. Pp. 448. Price, \$3.00. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1896.

It is a matter of primary importance to the advance of scientific thought that the views of conflicting schools be clearly and definitely presented. The endeavor to reconcile essentially conflicting views, has often been more of a barrier than an aid to progress. The work of Professor Willoughby may be regarded as a treatise on political science from the juristic standpoint. Although he is continually making reference to the psychic factors underlying political association, yet his conclusions are scarcely influenced by such factors. In fact, the general tenor of the work is more in harmony with Austin than any of the recent treatises on political science; and this, in spite of the fact that the author disagrees with Austin